



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,580	02/23/2004	Jean-Marie Gatto	CYBS5612CON	9649
22430	7590	10/27/2005	EXAMINER	
YOUNG LAW FIRM A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 4370 ALPINE ROAD SUITE 106 PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028			LEE, DIANE I	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	
DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/784,580	GATTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	D. I. Lee	2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 36-46 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 42-46 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 36-38 and 40 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 39 and 40 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Applicant's Response filed 22 August 2005. No claims have been amended; no claims have been canceled; and no claims have been newly added. Currently, claims 36-41 are remain pending in this application.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 22 August 2005 have been fully considered but they are persuasive. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection applied against claims 36-38 have been withdrawn. Furthermore, it is noted that, in the previous Office Action, the Examiner has applied a narrow interpretation to the limitation in claim (i.e., "quick release interlocking clips allowing the modules to be attached to or separated free from one another"). Upon careful consideration of the specific limitation, the Examiner has now applied a broader interpretation of the claim. Accordingly, a new ground of the rejection is now applied to claims 36-38 (see the rejection below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re claim 36: In lines 7-8 read "wherein the modules each include quick release interlocking clips allowing the modules to be attached to or separated from one another". First, Applicant has not clearly defined what is "quick release" of a device (i.e., interlocking clips). Without a reference value of a releasing mechanism of interlocking clip, it is unclear to identify the quick releasing mechanism. Second, Applicant has not define the structure of interlocking

clips other than the function of allowing the modules to be attached to or separated from one another.

For examining purpose, the above recitation has been interpreted as -- wherein the modules each include a release interlocking mechanism allowing the modules to be attached to or separated from one another--.

Accordingly, claim 36 and claims depend therefrom, i.e., claims 37-38 are vague and indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramachandran et al. [US 5,483,047-referred as Ramachandran].

Re claim 36: Ramachandran discloses a modular computer terminal comprising:
a document scanner module (a card reader placed behind the card accepting slot 24);

a control and processing electronics (not explicitly shown in figures);
a display module 22; and
an integrated printer 34.

Ramachandran does not teach the specifics of each module including claimed release interlocking mechanisms such as clips.

However, Ramachandran teaches that each module assembly is provided with component tray arranging the modules to extend from the enclosure at a time allowing the technician to perform all servicing functions of the components (i.e., the mounting system of Ramachandran allows each modules to be attached to or a separated from one another, for example, each tray of mounting system includes a plurality of locking bracket 216, 218 allowing each of the modules to be attached to or separated from one another) (see col. 3, lines 15+; col. 9, lines 61+; and figures 25+). In view of above discussion, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that each tray of mounting system of Ramachandran having a plurality of locking bracket obviously provides the claimed function of allowing the modules to be attached to or separated from one another in order to allow removal of the module in an event that the service technician has to replace the module within the enclosure.

Re claim 37: The terminal further comprising a terminal base (enclosure 12 including base surfaces having top wall 16 and side walls 14) housing the control and processing electronic (see figure 1); and a terminal casing (a fascia panel 18) removably fitted to the terminal base, the terminal casing enclosing the plurality of internal components including the document reader, printer, and display (see figure 1).

Re claim 38: wherein the terminal casing is configured to enclose a rotatably mounted cylindrical paper roll 76 that supplies paper to the printer, flat edges of the paper roll being substantially parallel to the base surface of the terminal (see figures 12-13 and 18).

8. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramachandran in view of Uchida [JP 02-2485278]. The teachings of Ramachandran have been discussed above.

Ramachandran fails to teach the printer includes a read-after print mechanism to detect printing failures.

Uchida teaches a printer having a read-after-print mechanism (a read mechanism) to read the printed data after printing to discriminate the success and failure of the printing.

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the read-after-print mechanism in order to raise the reliability of the printing process.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 42-46 are allowed.

10. Claims 39-40 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Ramachandran teaches that the terminal is an automated teller machine (ATM) having the document scanner module (a card reader placed behind the card accepting slot) use to carry out the transaction (e.g., the document scanner module scans a document) and the

receipt printer mechanism 68, which is to print customer receipts having printed information associating with the scanned document on the paper that is drawn from a roll. The receipt printing process is usually performed after the transaction.

Uchida teaches a printer having a read-after-print mechanism (a read mechanism) to read the printed data after printing (reading a readable code of magnetic data printed on the paper) to discriminate the success and failure of the printing, which obviously teaches that the read mechanism includes a code reader.

One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the teachings of Ramachandran and Uchida, alone or in combination with other references, in order to provide the readable code on the receipt linking the printed receipt to information scanned document subsequently displaying the information associated with scanned document when the code reader reads the code printed on the receipt, as set forth in the claims.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 36-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. I. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-2399. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2876

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



D. I. Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2876

D. L.